DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 925 TM 004 381

AUTHOR Goetz, Frank; LaBay, Michael
TITLE The SWRL Kindergarten Program (An Evaluation).
INSTITUTION Birmingham Public Schools, Mich.
PUB DATE Jul 74
NOTE 34p.; Best Copy Available, pages 16, 28, 29, and 30 may reproduce poorly

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Achievement Tests; Concept Formation; *Early Childhood Education; *Early Reading; *Kindergarten Children; Parent Attitudes; Preschool Teachers; *Program Evaluation; Reading Achievement; *Reading Programs; Reading Skills; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Vocabulary Development; Word Recognition
IDENTIFIERS *SWRL Kindergarten Program

ABSTRACT

The SWRL Kindergarten Program was developed by the Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (SWRL), a federally funded facility located in Inglewood, California. In Birmingham, interest in the SWRL program was stimulated and developed during the Fall of 1971. It was felt that this program would provide the children with an opportunity to be exposed to an early reading program. The components of the SWRL Program consisted of the Instructional Concepts Program (ICP) which was intended to introduce the children to concepts of shape, size, color, amounts, poisitions, and comparisons. Upon completion of the ICP, the Beginning Reading Program (BRP) was initiated. The goals of this program were to teach the children word recognition and the vocabulary of the program design. Some support systems were also developed to aid the children in maintaining or improving their acquired skills. (Author/DEP)

ED104925

# THE SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

## (AN EVALUATION)

BIRMINGHAM PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Birmingham, Michigan

July, 1974

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. Frank Goetz,
Director of Curriculum

Dr. Michael LaBay
Director of Evaluation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM 004 381

THE SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| COMPONENTS OF THE SWRL PROGRAM | 1 |
| The Instructional Concepts Program | |
| The Beginning Reading Program | |
| SUPPORT SYSTEMS | 2 |
| The Tutorial Program | |
| The Parent Assisted Learning Program | |
| The Summer Reading Program | |
| TEACHER INSERVICE | 3 |
| PARENT ORIENTATION | 3 |
| PROGRAM PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES | 3 |
| Parent Survey Results | |
| Teacher Survey Results | |
| Administrator Survey Results | |
| SWRL CHILDREN ONE YEAR LATER | 7 |
| SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS | 10 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS | 10 |
| APPENDICES | 12 |

# THE SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

## INTRODUCTION

The SWRL Kindergarten Program was developed by the Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (SWRL) a federally funded facility located in Inglewood, California. The materials and procedures were developed through carefully sequenced studies and extensive field tryouts involving more than 100,000 children over a period of four years.

Each of the Kindergarten Program components underwent continuous sequential evaluation which resulted in modification of the program on the basis of pupil performance data and teacher reactions. When the program had been refined to the point where it was ready for widespread dissemination, federal funds were made available under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In Birmingham, interest in the SWRL Kindergarten Program was stimulated and developed during the fall of 1971. It was felt this program held promise to meet a need of many of our children, viz to provide an opportunity for them to be exposed to an early reading program. Initial orientation of Elementary Principals regarding the features of the program was arranged through the office of the Director of Elementary Education. In turn, interest was generated among the Kindergarten Teachers in the district. With the assurance that sufficient support was apparent among teachers and principals and with the approval of the Board of Education, a federal grant was requested and approved through the Michigan Department of Education.

The principal and a kindergarten teacher in eight of our schools agreed to participate in the program. It was subsequently implemented at Bingham Farms, Bloomfield Village, Evergreen, Franklin, Pembroke, Quarton, Torry and Walnut Lake in September, 1972. We would like to express appreciation to Dr. Velma Ruhly, Principal of Franklin Elementary School, for her help in coordinating this program.

## COMPONENTS OF THE SWRL PROGRAM

### The Instructional Concepts Program

This component consists of 96 concepts (1) pertaining to colors, sizes, shapes, amounts, positions and comparisons. This component is introduced during the first month of school and runs for about 12 weeks. Successful participation in this sequence enables each child to utilize

(1) See Appendix A

the 96 concept terms. These concepts are considered basic to later success in academic programs. Many Birmingham children enter school with prior understanding of many of these concepts. This part of the program, therefore, may be offered on a partial or complete basis or omitted depending on the needs of the children in each individual school.

The Beginning Reading Program

Known originally as the First Year Communication Skills Program, this component has been renamed the Beginning Reading Program (BRP). The goals of the program are well defined (2). At the end of the 30 week sequence children should be able to:

1. Read the 100 words taught directly in the program.
2. Sound out and read new words composed of word elements taught in the program.
3. Demonstrate comprehension of the material read.

Instructional materials include individual story books that the children may keep and take home, flash cards, games, comprehension sheets, criterion exercises, and practice exercises. The program is organized into 10 units each requiring about 3 weeks to complete, assuming an instructional period of about 25 minutes per day.

SUPPORT SYSTEMS

The Tutorial Program

Upper grade pupils, aides or other non-professionals are trained to use specially prepared materials and procedures to tutor kindergarten pupils. The Tutorial Program supplements regular classroom instruction by providing additional practice for those children who have not yet attained program outcomes.

The Parent-Assisted Learning Program (PAL)

PAL supplements regular classroom instruction of BRP students through the cooperation and structured assistance of each child's parents. Parents are trained to use instructional exercises and learning games that provide practice in specific reading skills being developed by the teacher in the classroom.

---

(2) Appendix B

The Summer Reading Program

A ten week parent-guided summer program following the kindergarten year is optional and is designed to help the children maintain and improve the reading skills acquired in kindergarten.

TEACHER INSERVICE

Teachers in the program received two half-days of inservice prior to implementation of the program and two shorter sessions during the course of the kindergarten year. This training was provided by the Program Coordinator, Dr. Velma Ruhly who had been given prior inservice.

PARENT ORIENTATION

In order to gain the support of parents and to enlist their cooperation in participating with their children in the program, an orientation meeting was conducted in most schools. Parents were invited in and given an explanation of what the program was designed to do. Printed materials, designed to provide information about the program, were distributed and discussed.

PROGRAM PROCEDURES AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Each child enrolled in the program was given an entry survey test. This test was intended to determine the entry level of the children with regard to the goals of the program. With 28 being the highest possible score, school means range from 13.5 to 15.8 with a district mean of 15.1 (see Table I).

The Instructional Concepts Program was introduced in September or October and completed in December or January. An end-of-program ICP Test was given and the results sent to the Regional Lab. Table I shows that out of a possible score of 30 the means ranged from 27.1 to 29.4 with a district mean of 28.0.

About three weeks after the ICP began, children were introduced to the Beginning Reading Program. These two programs ran simultaneously for a few weeks until the ICP was completed. The BRP then continued to the end of the school year. At that time an end-of-program test was given to all students who had completed all or most of the program. These results were also sent to the Regional Lab for analysis(3). Table I shows results of the four subtests.

The highest possible score on the sight word subtest was 18. The school means ranged from 13.3 to 17.8 with a district mean of 14.7.

---

(3) Appendix C

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIVE MEASURES

SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

| SCHOOL | Entry Survey (0--28) Mean | ICP (0--30) Mean | Sight Words (0--18) Mean | Word Element (0--9) Mean | Letter Names (0--62) Mean | Sentences (0--10) Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWRL A | 13.5 | 27.1 | 15.0 | 7.7 | 5.7 | 6.0 |
| SWRL B | 13.9 | 28.0 | 16.0 | 8.4 | 5.6 | 8.8 |
| SWRL C | 15.1 | 27.8 | 13.8 | 7.3 | 5.7 | 6.4 |
| SWRL D | 15.3 | 27.4 | 15.8 | 8.0 | 5.7 | 8.1 |
| SWRL E | 15.4 | 29.4 | 16.9 | 8.8 | 5.7 | 9.0 |
| SWRL F | 15.5 | 28.3 | 17.4 | 8.7 | 5.6 | 9.2 |
| SWRL G | 15.7 | 27.9 | 13.3 | 6.2 | 5.8 | 3.8 |
| SWRL H | 15.8 | 27.4 | 17.8 | 8.9 | 5.9 | 9.9 |
| SWRL All Schools | 15.1 | 28.0 | 14.7 | 8.0 | 5.7 | 7.8 |
| Control I | | | 9.1 | 5.4 | 5.2 | .4 |
| Control J | | | 10.4 | 6.2 | 5.7 | .9 |
| Control K | | | 11.1 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 1.3 |
| Control All Schools | | | 10.2 | 5.6 | 5.3 | .9 |

For word elements the highest possible score was 9.0. The means ranged from 6.2 to 8.9 with a district mean of 8.0. The highest possible score for Letter Names was 6.0. School means ranged from 5.6 to 5.9, district mean 5.7. Sentence understanding had a possible high score of 10.0. Means ranged from 3.8 (an isolated low) to 9.9 with a district mean of 7.8

The Beginning Reading Program being the component considered most challenging and with the greatest potential for Birmingham children, the decision was made to compare achievement of SWRL children with children who had not been in the program. A random sample of three non-SWRL schools was selected. The BRP end-of-program test was administered to those three control classes. Table I summarizes these results. There were no significant differences between this control group and the SWRL children on the letter naming subtest. However, on the other three subtests, viz., sight words, word elements and sentence understanding, the SWRL children performed significantly better. The difference in sentence understanding was especially dramatic.

No comparison was attempted with the ICP due to the belief that kindergarten teachers do an effective job of teaching these concepts using other methods.

In addition to test results of children at the end of the first year, it was determined we should have opinions of teachers, principals, and parents of children who participated in the program. Therefore, these groups were surveyed.

## Parent Survey Results (4)

In late May of 1973, an opinionnaire was sent to each of the 217 parents who had children in the program. One hundred forty nine (149) were returned (68.7%). District results may be found in Appendix D. A summary of some of the more important questions should be of interest and helpful in assessing the value of the program.

Ninety-three percent of the parents indicated their children enjoyed participation in the program much or very much; 1.4% indicated their children enjoyed participation very little or not at all. Ninety percent said they believed the objectives of the ICP had been accomplished very well. Combining moderately well with very well the percent was 100%. For the Beginning Reading Program the results were 78.3% and 98.6% respectively whereas 1.4% thought objectives of the program were not being accomplished with their children.

Compared with other kindergarten programs parents were familiar with, 85.6% rated the SWRL Program as superior. Parents indicated the program stimulated and challenged their child (81.9%) whereas 2.7% said they felt the program had unduly pressured their child.

(4) Appendix D

Of the parents who participated in the PAL Program, 81.3% said it was effective. Seventy five percent said they felt their child was very well prepared for the second year of school and 22.9% indicated adequate preparation; only 2.1% felt their child was poorly prepared. Parents said their children were reading other materials at home (79.6%). Almost 97% indicated the program should be continued or expanded, while 3% thought it should be eliminated.

These results suggest quite clearly that parents whose children participated in the program were very favorably impressed and desired that it should be continued.

Teacher Survey Results(5)

In March the teachers were surveyed to determine if they would want to continue the program for another year. Eight teachers started the program in September and a ninth was added in the spring. Some questions, therefore, had 8 respondents and some 9. Participation in the ICP was satisfying to all the teachers. Seven expressed satisfaction with the BRP, one was dissatisfied and one found it "so-so". All teachers indicated children enjoyed participation in both ICP and BRP.

With regard to the time required to teach the ICP, four thought it was just right and four felt it was excessive. Six teachers felt the instructional time was just right for the BRP, two indicated it was excessive. In terms of being ready for the next school year, four teachers thought their children were better prepared and four thought the preparation was about the same.

Objectives of the ICP were assessed to have been accomplished very well by seven of the eight teachers and moderately well by one. For the BRP, six indicated objectives had been accomplished very well and three moderately well. Seven teachers who used the PAL Program said it was helpful. The four teachers who used the Tutor Program found it to be helpful.

Recordkeeping was considered time-consuming but necessary by 7 of the teachers; one found it unnecessarily time-consuming. Seven of the teachers indicated the SWRL Program did not conflict with their philosophy of kindergarten instruction, two teachers indicated there was some conflict. Seven teachers felt the inservice they received was adequate to very adequate; one felt it was inadequate. Eight teachers expressed a desire to continue to participate in the SWRL Program. One chose not to continue. Six teachers said the program should be continued and expanded; no one suggested it be eliminated.

(5) Appendix E

The large majority of teachers who participated in the program were satisfied with and supportive of the program. They wished to continue in it and they recommended to Curriculum Council that the program be made available to other schools on an optional basis. (See Curriculum Council Minutes April 10, 1973).

Administrator Survey Results(6)

Principals of the eight schools were surveyed in March at the same time as teachers. Six principals agreed with teachers that the program stimulated and challenged the children, one saw no noticeable difference and one saw undue pressure. Seven said that children enjoyed participating in the program much or very much. Six indicated the objectives of ICP had been accomplished very well and one moderately well. BRP objectives had been accomplished very well according to five principals and two assessed accomplishments as moderately well. Five judged the SWRL Program as superior to other kindergarten programs while one said it was about the same and one appraised it as inferior.

All principals said parents were supportive and that kindergarten teachers were positive. The program was judged not to be in conflict with their philosophy by six of the principals, one saw some conflict. Five suggested the program be continued and four said it should be expanded. No one opted for eliminating the program.

SWRL CHILDREN ONE YEAR LATER

In order to more completely assess the longer range outcomes of the SWRL Program, a longitudinal study was conducted. Dr. Michael LaBay, Director of Evaluation, assisted with this portion of the study. His report is included here.

INTRODUCTION

On April 13, 1973 the Department of Curriculum asked that the Department of Evaluation assist them in evaluating the effects of the district's SWRL Reading Program on reading achievement.

A description of program components, guidelines, and evaluation methods are on file with the Department of Curriculum. This report is part of a larger evaluation effort involving assessments of parents, staff, and student attitudes as well as diagnosis, prescription, and assessment of academic progress using pupil performance objectives.

(6) Appendix F

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report presents academic test results and analysis in an attempt to determine if SWRL students differ from non-SWRL students in reading achievement at the end of their first year.

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

A random sample of first grade pupils enrolled in the Birmingham Public Schools as of May 1, 1974 was used in the study. Pupils were selected by proportional allocation based upon first grade enrollment within each of the district's elementary schools. An original sample of 50 SWRL and 50 control children were drawn from student lists. Groups of pupils ranged in size from 1 (Westchester) to 9 (Quarton). All schools except Bloomfield Village were included in the project.

The school records of each of the 100 children selected for testing were reviewed to double check building location and to record academic aptitude scores obtained on the Primary Mental Abilities (PMA) Test the previous year.

Of the 100 original pupils selected for study, 44 SWRL and 28 control children had recorded PMA total scores and were available for achievement testing. It is assumed, therefore, that these final pupils were a random sample of all children within the district who were given the PMA in 1972-73 and were enrolled in their respective schools as of May 1, 1974.

One test coordinator administered the entire PACER-I (Book Two) Initial Reading Survey to all study pupils in small groups (less than 4) from May 14 through May 28, 1974. Testing procedures, as defined in the PACER manual, were followed with all the children.

RESULTS

Mini-Pacer analysis of test scores without controlling for academic aptitude indicated that the SWRL and control pupils attained similar scores on each of the six PACER subtests. Table 1 summarizes these findings.

**TABLE I**

MINI-PACER ANALYSIS RESULTS OF SWRL AND CONTROL MEAN PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS (PACER-I)

| | CWRL Subtest Performance | | | | | | SWRL Subtest Performance | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subtest No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Pupil Count | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 |
| Mean | 11.98 | 8.00 | 7.61 | 6.98 | 7.57 | 10.07 | 11.93 | 7.86 | 7.75 | 7.18 | 7.46 | 10.54 |
| Std. Devel. | 0.15 | 0.000 | 1.05 | 1.51 | 1.05 | 2.77 | 0.37 | 0.44 | 0.83 | 1.49 | 1.40 | 1.82 |

Subtest Definitions:
1= Sight Vocabulary
2= Initial Consonant Substitution
3= Compound Words
4= Inflected Endings
5= Comprehension, Sentence Completion
6= Comprehension, Main Idea, Sequence and Detail.

Considering the proportion of pupils correctly answering all items within subtests, Table II indicates that significantly more SWRL children attained perfect scores in subtest 2 than control. All other subtest breakdowns indicate no significant difference between the two groups.

TABLE II

MINI-PACER ANALYSIS RESULTS OF SWRL AND CONTROL CRITERION ATTAINMENT
(CRITERION SET AT MAXIMUM SCORE)

| SWRL Subtest Performance | | | | | | | SWRL Subtest Performance | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subtest No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Pupil Count | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 |
| Achieved Criterion | 43 | 44 | 38 | 27 | 36 | 23 | 27 | 25 | 25 | 20 | 23 | 12 |

| Number | Subtest | Comparison between groups using z-test of proportions |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Sight Vocabulary | No significant difference ~~(=.05)~~ |
| 2 | Initial Consonant Substitution | Significant difference |
| 3 | Compound Words | No significant difference |
| 4 | Inflected Endings | No significant difference |
| 5 | Comprehension, sentence comp. | No significant difference |
| 6 | Comprehension, Main Idea, etc. | No significant difference |

When each subtest score was controlled for academic aptitude through covariance analysis (PMA total raw scores used as covariate) results indicated that:

1. The SWRL and the control groups were not significantly different in their PMA scores.
2. The correlation between PMA scores and PACER subtest scores was nonsignificant.
3. The two groups did not differ in achievement on any PACER subtest when academic aptitude controls were enforced.

Tables 3 through 8 summarize the above findings.(7)

CONCLUSIONS

The information presented in this report indicates that children with one year of previous experience in the SWRL Program at the K level did not achieve at a level significantly higher than children in other programs throughout the district, as measured by the PACER battery.

The two sample groups selected for study were not significantly different in academic aptitude, as measured by the PMA battery.

When each child's aptitude was considered through covariance analysis procedures, the SWRL group again was not significantly different in PACER-measured reading ability.

Assuming that PACER battery adequately measures the ability to read at the end of grade one, the data of this report indicates that the district's SWRL Program did not produce achievement levels above those expected in other district program.

Dr. Michael LaBay
Director of Evaluation

(7) Appendix G

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

As one reads through this report, there are many minor and a few major conclusions. The more pertinent ones will be listed here. Additional questions asked about the program as it was developed by the Southwest Laboratory are included in Appendix H.

1. In the opinion of the parents, teachers, and administrators, who participated in the project, the objectives of both the Instructional Concepts Program and the Beginning Reading Program were accomplished. This opinion is substantiated by end-of-program test results.

2. Children who participated in the program scored significantly better on subtests (a) measuring knowledge of sight words, (b) word elements, (c) sentence meaning than did control children who did not participate. There was no significant difference in achievement of the experimental and control group on subtest (d) naming letters. This latter finding suggests that non-SWRL teachers are teaching letter recognition. This is an outcome of the phonovisual program which is taught in many schools.

3. There was no significant difference in the reading achievement of SWRL and non-SWRL children as determined by the PACER Reading Test administered at the end of grade one. This finding is difficult to explain in view of the substantial difference in achievement found at the end of the kindergarten year. The possibility suggests itself that first grade teachers are not maintaining the reading achievement lead that SWRL pupils evidenced at the end of their kindergarten year. Another possibility, of course, is that the program really does not, in the longer term, make a lasting difference.

4. Parents, teachers, and administrators expressed strong support for the program and wished to see it continued.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The SWRL Kindergarten Program should be continued as an optional program in the district at the kindergarten level.

2. All but very immature kindergarten children in a school where the program is offered should be included in an instructional group and in the program.

3. Use of support systems is recommended. Unhealthy pressure must be carefully avoided.

4. Schools that have the program and plan to continue it are advised to assess their reading program delivery system at the first grade level to determine if there may be ways of maintaining the achievement lead evidenced by SWRL children at the end of their kindergarten year.

Dr. Frank Goetz,
Director of Curriculum

APPENDICES

Program Outcomes: ICP ..... A

Program Outcomes: BRP..... B

Quality Assurance Data (5 pages)..... C

Parent Opinionnaire Results ..... D

Teacher Opinionnaire Results..... E

Administrator Opinionnaire Results..... F

Subtest Results of PACER Reading Test..... G

Questions Asked About The SWRL Kindergarten Program..... H

# ICP PROGRAM OUTCOMES CHART APPENDIX A

## UNIT 1 – COLORS AND DIRECTION FOLLOWING SKILLS

INITIAL INSTRUCTION
1* Red, Blue
2 Yellow, Black
3 White, Brown
4 Green, Purple
5 Orange, Pink
6 Row, Numerals 1 to 5
7 Turn, Page, Mark, Box
ASSESSMENT
8 Criterion Exercise – Unit 1
SECOND INSTRUCTION
9 Practice Exercise A – Unit 1
10 Practice Exercise B – Unit 1

## UNIT 2 – SIZES

INITIAL INSTRUCTION
1 Larger, Smaller, Largest, Smallest
2 Shorter, Longer, Longest
3 Shorter, Taller, Shortest, Tallest
4 Thicker, Thinner
ASSESSMENT
5 Criterion Exercise – Unit 2
SECOND INSTRUCTION
6 Practice Exercise A – Unit 2
7 Practice Exercise B – Unit 2

## UNIT 3 – AMOUNTS

INITIAL INSTRUCTION
1 One, Two, Three, Four
2 Five, Six, Seven
3 Eight, Nine, Ten
4 All, Some, None, No
5 More, Less, Most, Least
ASSESSMENT
6 Criterion Exercise – Unit 3
SECOND INSTRUCTION
7 Practice Exercise A – Unit 3
8 Practice Exercise B – Unit 3

## UNIT 4 – SHAPES

INITIAL INSTRUCTION
1 Circle, Square, Triangle
2 Rectangle, Straight and Curved Lines
ASSESSMENT
3 Criterion Exercise – Unit 4
SECOND INSTRUCTION
4 Practice Exercise A – Unit 4
5 Practice Exercise B – Unit 4

*lesson number

## UNIT 5 – POSITIONS

INITIAL INSTRUCTION
1 Front, Back, Middle
2 Top, Bottom, Side
3 Behind, In Front, Between
4 Beside, Next To, Around
5 Above, Below, Over, Under
6 Inside, Outside
7 Right, Left
8 First, Last, Beginning, End
9 First, Second, Third, Fourth
ASSESSMENT
10 Criterion Exercise – Unit 5
SECOND INSTRUCTION
11 Practice Exercise A – Unit 5
12 Practice Exercise B – Unit 5

## UNIT 6 – PRE-MATHEMATICS

INITIAL INSTRUCTION
1 Equal, Unequal (Amount)
2 Same, Different (Size, Shape, Color, Amount)
3 Not Equal or Not Same
4 Combined Colors and Shapes
5 Combined Colors and Sizes, Shapes and Sizes
6 Combined Shapes and Positions, Sizes and Positions
ASSESSMENT
7 Criterion Exercise – Unit 6
SECOND INSTRUCTION
8 Practice Exercise A – Unit 6
9 Practice Exercise B – Unit 6

## UNIT 7 – PRE-READING

**(If the children have already begun to read, the lessons in this unit may not be necessary.)**

INITIAL INSTRUCTION
1 First, Last (Time)
2 Before, After (Time)
3 Letter, Word
4 Sound, Name
ASSESSMENT
5 Criterion Exercise – Unit 7
SECOND INSTRUCTION
6 Practice Exercise A – Unit 7
7 Practice Exercise B – Unit 7

BRP PROGRAM OUTCOMES CHART APPENDIX B

**Outcome 1:** Words that the children learn to read
**Outcome 2:** Beginning and ending word elements that the children learn to identify
**Outcome 3:** Word-attack skills that the children learn to apply
**Outcome 4:** Letter names, both for capital and lower-case letters, that the children learn to identify when shown the letters

| Unit | No. of Weeks | | Outcome Number 1 Words | 2 Word Elements | 3 Word Attack | 4 Letter Names |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 25 min. per day | 40 min. per day | | | | |
| 1 | 5 | 3 | I Sam see am<br>me Mat | s m at | | s m e<br>a i t |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | Mit Sis meet in<br>it sit on is | it eet | | n o h |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | sat Ann this and<br>Nan a man the | th an n | | w f d |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | mad that at Sid<br>we will with fell<br>mess | ad w ill f | | l r b |

| Unit | 25 min. per day | 40 min per day | Outcome 1 Words | 2 Word Elements | 3 Word Attack | 4 Letter Names |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 3 | 2 | fit Nat sun them<br>us what feet fun<br>run | un r | By Unit 5 and thereafter, the children should be able to sound out and read any one-syllable word composed of word elements taught previously in the program. Specific words for word-attack instruction are listed in the Activities and Materials Guides. | u c y |
| 6 | 3 | 2 | Nell who yes did<br>Ed let well need<br>she | ell et l eed | | |
| 7 | 3 | 2 | net ran sad no<br>fill sheet shut mud | ut sh | | p k g |
| 8 | 3 | 2 | sand sell shell fish<br>hat he then nut<br>rat set feel not<br>fat if wet | en h | | |
| 9 | 3 | 2 | fan win hand hill<br>seed weed met hit<br>was to bad him<br>men be | b | | x z j<br>q v |
| 10 | 3 | 2 | bat his wish ball<br>bell but has said<br>ant Ben bus had<br>bed bee Bill hid | | | |

STATE MICHIGAN
DISTRICT SCH DIST OF THE CITY

1972-73 KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM INSTALLATION
QUALITY ASSURANCE DATA
DISTRICT REPORT

1135

APPENDIX C

## SUMMARY OF ALL SCHOOLS

| | ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE | | | | ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | ICP COMPLETE MEASURE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 14 | 158 | 62 | 171 | 171 | 171 | 171 | 171 | 171 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 223 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 15.1 | | | 11.7 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 11.7 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 11.3 | | 28.0 | | |
| DATE EARLIEST | | | | | SE27 | OC 6 | OC20 | OC26 | NO17 | DE 1 | DE12 | | DE18 | | |
| COMPLETED LATEST | | | | | OC 6 | OC13 | OC26 | NO 3 | DE 1 | DE10 | JA 9 | | FE22 | | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | MIN PACE | 7 UNITS 10 WEEKS | | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | | | | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | MAX PACE | 7 UNITS 15 WEEKS | | |

| | BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | | | | BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 | SIGHT WORDS 0-8 | SIGHT WORDS 9-13 | SIGHT WORDS 14-[illegible] | WORD ELEMENTS 0-3 | WORD ELEMENTS 4-6 | WORD ELEMENTS 7-9 | LETTER NAMES 0-2 | LETTER NAMES 3-4 | LETTER NAMES 5-6 | SENTENCES 0-4 | SENTENCES 5-7 | SENTENCES 8-10 |
| PUPILS | | | | | | | | | | | 10 | 58 | 14[illegible] | 2 | 24 | 161 | 0 | 4 | 213 | 26 | 54 | 137 |
| MEAN SCORE | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | | | 14.7 | | | 8.0 | | | 5.7 | | | 7.8 | | |
| EARLY DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LATE DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DURATION MIN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## SUMMARY OF DISTRICT PARTICIPATION

| SCHOOL NAME | NUMBER OF CLASSES | PROGRAM USE ICP ONLY | PROGRAM USE BRP ONLY | PROGRAM USE BOTH | RETURN OF QA DATA: ENTRY SURVEY R | ENTRY SURVEY NR | ICP UNIT REPORT R | ICP UNIT REPORT NR | ICP ASSESSMENT R | ICP ASSESSMENT NR | BRP UNIT REPORT R | BRP UNIT REPORT NR | BRP ASSESSMENT R | BRP ASSESSMENT NR | SCHOOL INFORMATION SHEET R | SCHOOL INFORMATION SHEET NR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BINGHAM FARMS | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| BLOOMFIELD VILLAGE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| EVERGREEN | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| FRANKLIN | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| PEMBROKE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| QUARTON | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| TORRY | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| WALNUT | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| ALL SCHOOLS | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 |

R = NUMBER RETURNING THE COMPONENT NR = NUMBER NOT RETURNING THE COMPONENT

## SCHOOL D

| | ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE | | | | ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | ICP COMPLETION MEASURE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 1 | 23 | 8 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 44 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 15.3 | | | 11.6 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 11.7 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 11.5 | | 27.4 | | |
| DATE EARLIEST | | | | | SE29 | OC10 | OC23 | NO 3 | NO22 | DE 6 | DE15 | | JA 3 | | |
| COMPLETED LATEST | | | | | SE29 | OC10 | OC23 | NO 3 | NO22 | DE 6 | DE15 | | JA 3 | | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | | | | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | MIN PACE | 7 UNITS 12 WEEKS | | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | | | | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | MAX PACE | 7 UNITS 12 WEEKS | | |

| | BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | | | | BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 | SIGHT WORDS 0-8 | SIGHT WORDS 9-13 | SIGHT WORDS 14-18 | WORD ELEMENTS 0-3 | WORD ELEMENTS 4-6 | WORD ELEMENTS 7-9 | LETTER NAMES 0-2 | LETTER NAMES 3-4 | LETTER NAMES 5-6 | SENTENCES 0-4 | SENTENCES 5-7 | SENTENCES 8-10 |
| PUPILS | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 7 | 23 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 0 | 1 | 29 | 2 | 7 | 21 |
| MEAN SCORE | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | | | 15.8 | | | 8.6 | | | 5.7 | | | 8.1 | | |
| EARLY DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LATE DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DURATION MIN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## SCHOOL F

| | ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE | | | | ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | ICP COMPLETION MEASURE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 2 | 17 | 10 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 15.5 | | | 11.7 | 11.1 | 11.4 | 11.7 | 10.8 | 10.7 | 11.1 | | 28.3 | | |
| DATE EARLIEST | | | | | SE27 | OC 6 | OC23 | OC30 | NO17 | DE 1 | DE12 | | JA 4 | | |
| COMPLETED LATEST | | | | | SE27 | OC 6 | OC23 | OC30 | NO17 | DE 1 | DE12 | | JA 4 | | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | MIN PACE | 7 UNITS 11 WEEKS | | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | MAX PACE | 7 UNITS 11 WEEKS | | |

| | BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | | | | BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 | SIGHT WORDS 0-8 | SIGHT WORDS 9-13 | SIGHT WORDS 14-18 | WORD ELEMENTS 0-3 | WORD ELEMENTS 4-6 | WORD ELEMENTS 7-9 | LETTER NAMES 0-2 | LETTER NAMES 3-4 | LETTER NAMES 5-6 | SENTENCES 0-4 | SENTENCES 5-7 | SENTENCES 8-10 |
| PUPILS | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 1 | 2 | 28 |
| MEAN SCORE | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | | | 17.4 | | | 8.7 | | | 5.6 | | | 9.1 | | |
| EARLY DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LATE DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DURATION MIN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## SCHOOL B

| | ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE | | | | ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | ICP COMPLETION MEASURE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 4 | 20 | 6 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 13.9 | | | 11.5 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.7 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 11.2 | | | 28.0 | |
| DATE EARLIEST | | | | | SE29 | OC10 | OC20 | OC27 | NO21 | DE12 | DE15 | | | JA11 | |
| COMPLETED LATEST | | | | | SE29 | OC10 | OC20 | OC27 | NO21 | DE12 | DE15 | | | JA11 | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | | | | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | | MIN PACE 7 UNITS 12 WEEKS | | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | | | | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | | MAX PACE 7 UNITS 12 WEEKS | | |

| | BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | | | | BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 | SIGHT WORDS | | | WORD ELEMENTS | | | LETTER NAMES | | | SENTENCES | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | 0-8 | 9-13 | 14-18 | 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 0-4 | 5-7 | 8-10 |
| PUPILS | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 5 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 5 | 21 |
| MEAN SCORE | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | | | 16.0 | | | 8.4 | | | 5.6 | | | 8.8 | | |
| EARLY DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LATE DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DURATION MIN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## SCHOOL A

| | ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE | | | | ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | ICP COMPLETION MEASURE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 4 | 16 | 1 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 13.5 | | | 11.8 | 11.4 | 11.0 | 11.1 | 9.8 | 10.1 | 10.7 | | | 27.1 | |
| DATE EARLIEST | | | | | SE27 | OC 6 | OC20 | OC26 | NO27 | DE18 | JA 9 | | | JA19 | |
| COMPLETED LATEST | | | | | SE27 | OC 6 | OC20 | OC26 | NO27 | DE18 | JA 9 | | | JA19 | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | | MIN PACE 7 UNITS 15 WEEKS | | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | | MAX PACE 7 UNITS 15 WEEKS | | |

| | BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | | | | BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 | SIGHT WORDS | | | WORD ELEMENTS | | | LETTER NAMES | | | SENTENCES | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | 0-8 | 9-13 | 14-18 | 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 0-4 | 5-7 | 8-10 |
| PUPILS | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| MEAN SCORE | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | | | 15.0 | | | 7.7 | | | 5.7 | | | 6.0 | | |
| EARLY DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LATE DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DURATION MIN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## SCHOOL E

| | ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE | | | | ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | ICP COMPLETION MEASURE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 1 | 22 | 11 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 15.4 | | | 12.0 | 11.6 | 11.4 | 11.6 | 10.6 | 11.1 | 11.5 | | 29.4 | | |
| DATE EARLIEST | | | | | SE30 | OC 7 | OC20 | OC27 | NO24 | DE 6 | DE14 | | FE22 | | |
| COMPLETED LATEST | | | | | SE30 | OC 7 | OC20 | Oc27 | NO24 | DE 6 | DE14 | | FE22 | | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | MIN PACE | 7 UNITS 11 WEEKS | | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | MAX PACE | 7 UNITS 11 WEEKS | | |

| | BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCEY | | | | | | | | | | BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 | SIGHT WORDS 0-8 | SIGHT WORDS 9-13 | SIGHT WORDS 14-18 | WORD ELEMENTS 0-3 | WORD ELEMENTS 4-6 | WORD ELEMENTS 7-9 | LETTER NAMES 0-2 | LETTER NAMES 3-4 | LETTER NAMES 5-6 | SENTENCES 0-4 | SENTENCES 5-7 | SENTENCES 8-10 |
| PUPILS | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 0 | 5 | 25 |
| MEAN SCORE | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | | | 8.8 | | | .0 | | | 5.7 | | | 9.0 | | |
| EARLY DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LATE DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DURATION MIN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## SCHOOL C

| | ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE | | | | ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCEY | | | | | | | ICP COMPLETION MEASURE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 0 | 27 | 6 | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 34 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 15.1 | | | | | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | 27.8 | | |
| DATE EARLIEST | | | | | | | | | | | | | DE18 | | |
| COMPLETED LATEST | | | | | | | | | | | | | DE18 | | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | | | | BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 | SIGHT WORDS 0-8 | SIGHT WORDS 9-13 | SIGHT WORDS 14-18 | WORD ELEMENTS 0-3 | WORD ELEMENTS 4-6 | WORD ELEMENTS 7-9 | LETTER NAMES 0-2 | LETTER NAMES 3-4 | LETTER NAMES 5-6 | SENTENCES 0-4 | SENTENCES 5-7 | SENTENCES 8-10 |
| PUPILS | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 9 | 23 | 2 | 4 | 29 | 0 | 1 | 34 | 5 | 22 | 8 |
| MEAN SCORE | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | | | 13.8 | | | 7.3 | | | 5.7 | | | 6.4 | | |
| EARLY DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LATE DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DURATION MIN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## SCHOOL H

| | ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE | | | | ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | ICP COMPLETION MEASURE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 2 | 17 | 12 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 15.8 | | | 11.9 | 11.6 | 11.8 | 12.0 | 11.3 | 11.1 | 11.8 | | 27.4 | | |
| DATE EARLIEST | | | | | OC 6 | OC13 | OC26 | OC29 | DE 1 | DE 7 | DE14 | | DE18 | | |
| COMPLETED LATEST | | | | | OC 6 | OC13 | OC26 | OC29 | DE 1 | DE 7 | DE14 | | DE18 | | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | MIN PACE 7 UNITS 10 WEEKS | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | MAX PACE 7 UNITS 10 WEEKS | | | |

| | BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | | | | BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 | SIGHT WORDS 0-8 | 9-13 | 14-18 | WORD ELEMENTS 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 | LETTER NAMES 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | SENTENCES 0-4 | 5-7 | 8-10 |
| PUPILS | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| MEAN SCORE | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | | | 17.8 | | | 8.9 | | | 5.9 | | | 9.9 | | |
| EARLY DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LATE DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DURATION MIN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## SCHOOL G

| | ENTRY SURVEY MEASURE | | | | ICP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | ICP COMPLETION MEASURE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-4 | 5-10 | 11-16 | 17-22 | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | 0-6 | 7-14 | 15-22 | 23-30 |
| NUMBER OF PUPILS | 0 | 0 | 16 | 8 | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| MEAN SCORE | | 15.7 | | | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | 27.9 | | |
| DATE EARLIEST | | | | | | | | | | | | | JA 4 | | |
| COMPLETED LATEST | | | | | | | | | | | | | JA 4 | | |
| DURATION MINIMUM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAXIMUM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | BRP UNIT PACING AND PROFICIENCY | | | | | | | | | | BRP END-OF-YEAR MEASURE | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | UNIT 1 | UNIT 2 | UNIT 3 | UNIT 4 | UNIT 5 | UNIT 6 | UNIT 7 | UNIT 8 | UNIT 9 | UNIT 10 | SIGHT WORDS 0-8 | 9-13 | 14-18 | WORD ELEMENTS 0-3 | 4-6 | 7-9 | LETTER NAMES 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | SENTENCES 0-4 | 5-7 | 8-10 |
| PUPILS | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 16 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 14 | 7 | 4 |
| MEAN SCORE | DATA NOT RECEIVED | | | | | | | | | | 13.3 | | | 6.2 | | | 5.8 | | | 3.8 | | |
| EARLY DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LATE DATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DURATION MIN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IN WEEKS MAX | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

PARENT OPINIONNAIRE

School 8 Schools -- 149 returns

To help evaluate the SWRL Kindergarten Program used on a limited basis in Birmingham this last year, we are requesting that teachers, parents and administrators react to several questions. Your assistance is appreciated. Check all appropriate items. Please return the form to school within two days.

1. My child has enjoyed participation in the SWRL Program

| 75.2% | 17.4% | 6.0% | | .7% |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 112 very much | 26 much | 9 some | 1 very little | 1 not at all |

2. Did you receive printed literature explaining the SWRL Program?

| 96.6% | 3.4% |
|---|---|
| 144 yes | 5 no. |

Comment on its adequacy adequate, excellent, informative, easy, too difficult, good, not as expected

3. Did you participate in a parent orientation program at school?

| 61.7% | 38.3% |
|---|---|
| 92 yes | 57 no. |

4.T To the extent that I am able to judge, the objectives related to teaching concepts of color, size, etc., were accomplished.

| 90.3% | 8.7% | |
|---|---|---|
| 131 very well | 14 moderately well | -- poorly |

5. To the extent that I am able to judge, the objectives related to teaching beginning reading were/are being accomplished

| 78.3% | 20.3% | 1.4% |
|---|---|---|
| 108 very well | 28 moderately well | 2 poorly |

6. The SWRL Program has had the following effect on my child

| 81.9% | 2.7% | 10.7% | 4.7% |
|---|---|---|---|
| 122 stimulated and challenged | 4 unduly pressured | 16 both | 7 neither |

7. Compared to other Kindergarten Programs I am familiar with, the SWRL Program is

| 85.6% | 10.6% | 3.8% |
|---|---|---|
| 113 superior | 14 about the same | 5 inferior |

8. Having participated in the Parent Assistance Program (PAL) my reaction to its effectiveness is

| 51.5% | 29.8% | 15.7% | 3.0% |
|---|---|---|---|
| 69 very favorable | 40 favorable | 21 mixed emotions | 4 unfavorable |

9. The part(s) of the SWRL Program my child liked most was:

Reading and Books, Games, Numbers, Tests, Worksheets, Merit badge, All, Puzzles, Stories and characters, pictures, humor

SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE

MARCH 1973 School TALLY

To help evaluate the SWRL Kindergarten Program used on a limited basis in Birmingham this last year, we are requesting that teachers, parents and administrators react to several questions. Your assistance is appreciated. Check all appropriate areas and return to the Director of Curriculum within 2 days.

1. My participation in the SWRL Program was:

   A. ---ICP
   2 very satisfying 6 satisfying ____ so so ____ Unsatisfying

   B. ---BRP
   4 very satisfying 3 satisfying 1 so so ____ unsatisfying

2. The children enjoyed participating in the SWRL Program

   A. ---Instructional concepts: 5 very much 4 some ____ not at all

   B. ---Reading: 7 very much 2 some ____ not at all

3. The time required to adequately teach the Instructional Concepts Program was:

   4 just right 4 excessive

4. The time required to adequately teach the Reading Program was:

   5 just right 2 excessive

5. In what ways was the Program good for your children?

   A.

   B.

6. What approximate percent of parents reacted to the program?

   48.5 enthusiastically 29,7 positively 12.3 indifferently 9.5 negatively

7. In terms of readiness for the next school year, SWRL children compared with non-SWRL children (this year or other years)

   4 better prepared 4 about the same ____ less well prepared

8. Objectives of the Instructional Concepts Program were accomplished

   7 very well 1 moderately well ____ poorly

9. Objectives of the Beginning Reading Program were accomplished

   6 very well 3 moderately well ____ poorly

10. Record keeping was:

_____no problem  7 time consuming but necessary

1 unnecessarily time consuming

11. The SWRL Program in terms of my 1973 Kindergarten Philosophy is

7 acceptable  2 in conflict (explain)

_____

_____

12. The PAL Program was

7 helpful  1 unnecessary  2 not used  _____a problem (explain)

_____

_____

13. The Tutor Program was

4 helpful  _____unnecessary  3 not used  _____a problem (explain)

_____

_____

14. District In-Service preparation for participation in the program was

2 very adequate  5 adequate  1 inadequate

15. Would you want to participate in the SWRL Program next year?

7 Yes  1 no

16. I feel the program should be:

6 continued  6 expanded  _____eliminated

17. Criticisms of the program:

A. Record Keeping is a problem
B. Holding to a time schedule
C.

18. Suggestions for improving the teaching of the program.

Introduce vowels  screen out children not "ready"  Re-evaluate time schedules
Grouping children may help

19. Additional Comments:

ICP is not necessary for some children

_____

SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

ADMINISTRATOR OPINIONNAIRE

March, 1973 School [illegible]

To help evaluate the SWRL Kindergarten Program used on a limited basis in Birmingham this last year, we are requesting that teachers, parents and administrators react to several questions. Your assistance is appreciated. Check all appropriate areas. Please return to the office of Director of Curriculum within 2 days.

1. The SWRL Program has had the following effect on the children in my building.

   5 stimulated and challenged 1 unduly pressured
   1 no noticeable difference from previous program

2. Children have seemed to enjoy participating in the Program.

   2 very much 5 much 1 some ____ very little ____ not at all

3. In my estimation the objectives of the Instructional Concepts have been

   6 very well 1 moderately well ____ poorly

4. In my opinion the objectives of the BRP are or have been accomplished.

   5 very well 2 moderately well ____ poorly

5. Compared to other Kindergarten Programs the SWRL Program is

   5 superior 1 about same 1 inferior

6. We oriented parents to the program by

   7 providing literature 6 conducting an orientation program at school
   ____ other.
   (comment on parent reception of this orientation_____

   _____

7. With regard to the SWRL Program, parents have been

   7 supportive ____ indifferent ____ negative

8. My involvement in record keeping was

   6 no problem 1 time consuming but necessary ___ excessively time consuming

9. The reaction of the kindergarten teacher involved in the program has been

   7 positive ____ indifferent ____ negative

10. The SWRL Program assessed in terms of my Kindergarten Philosophy is

6 acceptable 1 in conflict (explain)_____

11. I feel the program should be

5 continued 4 expanded _____ eliminated

12. The PAL Program was

6 helpful _____ unnecessary 1 not used _____ a problem (explain)

_____

_____

13. The Tutor Program was

3 helpful _____ unnecessary 4 not used _____ a problem (explain)

_____

_____

14. At my school, if given the opportunity next year, I would like to involve

7 all kindergarten classes _____ 1 class _____ no class

15. Criticism of Program_____

_____

16. Suggestions for improving the operation of the program Re-evaluate pacing schedule; Include all children in program but fit it to their needs; Screen children out not "ready"

17. Additional comments:_____

_____

_____

## SUBTEST RESULTS OF PACER READING TEST

Table 3
SWRL Evaluation for Goetz By LaBay (1974)

Data Format (I1, F3.0,6F2.0) - SIGHT VOCABULARY

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: Problem No. 1 Covariate Variable 1 Criterion Variable 2

| Sources | DF | SSX | SP | SSY | ADJ DF | ADJ SSY | ADJ MSY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between | 1. | 268.000 | 18.875 | 1.332 | 1. | 1.563 | 1.563 |
| Within | 70. | 6783.000 | -49.938 | 132.613 | 69. | 132.246 | 1.917 |
| Total | 71. | 7051.000 | -31.063 | 133.945 | 70. | 133.808 | |

Analysis of Variance (Covariate) F = 2.766 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.935
Analysis of Variance (Criterion) F = 0.703 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.962
Analysis of Covariance(Criterion) F = 0.815 DF = 1, 69 Omega Squared = 0.960
Correlation of Cov. & Crit. Var. = -0.032 Slope = -0.007

Table 4
SWRL Evaluation for Goetz By LaBay (1974)

Data Format (I1, F3.0, 6F2.0) - INITIAL CONSONANT SUBSTITUTION

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE. Problem No. 2 Covariate Variable 1 Criterion Variable 3

| Sources | DF | SSX | SP | SSY | ADJ DF | ADJ SSY | ADJ MSY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between | 1. | 268.000 | 4.875 | 0.090 | 1. | 0.121 | 0.121 |
| Within | 70. | 6783.000 | -22.625 | 59.410 | 69. | 59.335 | 0.860 |
| Total | 71. | 7051.000 | -17.750 | 59.500 | 70. | 59.455 | |

Analysis of Variance (Covariate) F = 2.766 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.935
Analysis of Variance (Criterion) F = 0.106 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.970
Analysis of Covariance (Criterion) F = 0.140 DF = 1, 69 Omega Squared = 0.969
Correlation of Cov. & Crit. Var. = -0.027 Slope = -0.003

Table 5
SWRL Evaluation for Goetz By LaBay (1974)

Data Format (I1, F3.0, 6F2.01) - INFLECTED ENDINGS

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE. Prob No. 3 Covariate Variable 1 Criterion Variable 4

| Sources | DF | SSX | SP | SSY | ADJ DF | ADJ SSY | ADJ MSY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between | 1. | 268.000 | -6.375 | 0.152 | 1. | 0.315 | 0.315 |
| Within | 70. | 6783.000 | 75.563 | 179.629 | 69. | 178.787 | 2.591 |
| Total | 71. | 7051.000 | 69.188 | 179.781 | 70. | 179.102 | |

Analysis of Variance (Covariate) F = 2.766 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.935
Analysis of Variance (Criterion) F = 0.059 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.971
Analysis of Covariance (Criterion) F = 0.122 DF = 1, 69 Omega Squared = 0.970
Correlation of Cov. & Crit. Var. = 0.061 Slope = 0.011

Table 6
SWRL Evaluation For Goetz By LaBay (1974)

Data Format (I1, F3.0, 6F2.0) - COMPOUND WORDS

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE. Problem No. 4 Covariate Variable 1 Criterion Variable 5

| Sources | DF | SSX | SP | SSY | ADJ DF | ADJ SSY | ADJ MSY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between | 1. | 268.000 | -28.438 | 3.012 | 1. | 3.219 | 3.219 |
| Within | 70. | 6783.000 | 38.813 | 332.102 | 69. | 331.879 | 4.810 |
| Total | 71. | 7051.000 | 10.375 | 335.113 | 70. | 335.098 | |

Analysis of Variance (Covariate) F = 2.766 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.935
Analysis of Variance (Criterion) F = 0.635 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.963
Analysis of Covariance (Criterion F = 0.669 DF = 1, 69 Omega Squared = 0.962
Correlation of Cov. & Crit. Var. = 0.007 Slope = 0.006

Table 7
SWRL Evaluation for Goetz By LaBay (1974)

Data Format (I1, F3.0, 6F2.0) - COMPREHENSION - SENTENCE COMPLETION

| Sources | DF | SSX | SP | SSY | ADJ DF | ADJ SSY | ADJ MSY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between | 1. | 268.000 | -10.563 | 0.414 | 1. | 0.669 | 0.669 |
| Within | 70. | 6783.000 | 78.813 | 226.906 | 69. | 225.991 | 3.275 |
| Total | 71. | 7051.000 | 68.250 | 227.320 | 70. | 226.660 | |

Analysis of Variance (Covariate) F = 2.766 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.935
Analysis of Variance (Criterion) F = 0.128 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.970
Analysis of Covariance (Criterion) F = 0.204 DF = 1, 69 Omega Squared = 0.969
Correlation of Cov. & Crit. Var. = 0.054 Slope = 0.012

Table 8
SWRL Evaluation for Goetz by LaBay (1974)

Data Format (I1, F3.0, 6F2.0) COMPREHENSION - MAIN IDEA, ETC.

| Sources | DF | SSX | SP | SSY | ADJ DF | ADJ SSY | ADJ MSY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between | 1. | 268.000 | -10.563 | 0.548 | 1. | 0.669 | 0.669 |
| Within | 70. | 6783.000 | 78.813 | 216.811 | 69. | 225.991 | 3.275 |
| Total | 71. | 7051.000 | 68.250 | 217.3590 | 70. | 226.660 | |

Analysis of Variance (Covariate) F = 2.766 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.935
Analysis of Variance (Criterion) F = 0.130 DF = 1, 70 Omega Squared = 0.970
Analysis of Covariance (Criterion) F = 0.210 DF = 1, 69 Omega Squared = 0.969
Correlation of Cov. & Crit. Var. = 0.067 Slope = 0.034

# QUESTIONS ASKED ABOUT THE SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

1. Was the SWRL Kindergarten Program developed for use with groups or with individual children?

   The instructional program was developed to be effective when instruction is provided on a whole class, small group, or individual basis. The program has been shown to produce the intended outcomes with high dependability in a variety of instructional settings.

2. Is the Instructional Concepts Program (ICP) a reading readiness program?

   ICP was developed to help kindergarten children quickly learn conceptual skills identified as fundamental to academic achievement. It is a general school readiness rather than a reading readiness program. ICP is not a prerequisite for the Beginning Reading Program (BRP), which is a complete beginning reading program for the kindergarten pupil. The development of pre-reading and direction-following skills is stressed in early sections of BRP.

3. How were the concepts selected for ICP?

   From an analysis of curriculum guides, a list of concepts commonly used in first-grade instruction was compiled. This list of concepts was revised in accordance with the suggestions of experienced primary grade teachers and curriculum specialists, and analyses of pretest and posttest performance of more than 1,400 kindergarten children.

4. Are the two programs, BRP and ICP, used concurrently?

   ICP is not a prerequisite for BRP. However, it is suggested that if both ICP and BRP are to be used, that one or two units of ICP be completed before instruction in BRP begins. The initial experience of teachers and pupils with ICP will facilitate the introduction of BRP. After Unit 1 of ICP is completed, BRP Teacher Training should commence so that BRP can be introduced concurrently with ICP Unit 3 or sooner. Since ICP takes approximately 12 weeks to complete, the two programs will run concurrently for approximately eight weeks.

5. How has program effectiveness been insured?

   Effective product development procedures typically involve field testing of the product under conditions similar to those in which it will ultimately be used and revision of the product based upon performance of pupils under those conditions. The SWRL Kindergarten Program has been tried out with more than 100,000 kindergarten children. Each of the Kindergarten Program components has undergone continuous sequential evaluation. Beginning with early formulation activities in 1966, through the large-scale tryouts of 1969-70 and 1970-71, the Laboratory has continued to modify the Kindergarten Program on the basis of pupil performance data and teacher feedback. The Kindergarten Program is now ready for large-scale distribution.

6. How was the effectiveness of the Kindergarten Program evaluated?

The Kindergarten Program underwent the continuous formative evaluation cycle of development, evaluation and revision. Data were collected through criterion-referenced tests based on prespecified program outcomes, classroom observations by development personnel, and questionnaires and meetings with tryout teachers.

The measurement of pupil performance was criterion referenced. This means that measures were employed to determine a pupil's achievement in relation to an established performance criterion. The criterion-referenced approach to evaluation may be contrasted with norm-referenced measures, employed to determine a pupil's status in relation to others on the same instrument. The overall effectiveness of BRP was thus continuously evaluated in terms of the degree to which its designated instructional outcomes were attained in a variety of settings and at a given cost level.

7. What data exist on the effects of structured reading instruction on the personality of the kindergarten child?

Extensive data regarding the effects of BRP on kindergarten children were collected during the five-year tryout period through classroom observations and questionnaires completed by teachers and parents. Teachers and parents reported that their children did not experience undue pressure in the reading program, and that the children enjoyed participating in the program more than they enjoyed most school activities.

8. Was the Kindergarten Program developed for use with children of a particular aptitude level or socioeconomic status?

The Kindergarten Program was developed to accommodate the entire population of children who had not yet achieved the program objectives. A wide aptitude range was considered in the development of the program, and the widest possible range of socioeconomic status was included in field testing. The program was individualized such that students of all abilities could function at levels appropriate to their needs.

9. How is the progress of individual pupils assessed?

The programs are organized into units to provide check points for assessment of each child's progress. The teacher is able to verify the skill attainment of each child by administering the Criterion Exercise following each unit of instruction. If necessary, the teacher can prescribe certain Practice Exercises for pupils who have not yet attained the unit skills.

10. Are the Criterion Exercises a form of standardized test?

No. Criterion Exercises assess pupil learning on specific outcomes. They are not general achievement measures and are not used to compare pupils.

11. What are the duration and number of units of each instructional program?

The ICP consists of seven units and is completed in approximately 58 days if 20 minutes per day are used for instruction. The BRP is organized into ten units. Tryouts indicate that children are able to attain the planned learning outcomes of BRP when an average of approximately 25 minutes per day are used.

12. Does the Kindergarten Program affect a teacher's normal grouping procedures?

The classroom can be organized in any way suitable to the teacher. The program permits individualization of instruction based on reliable information concerning the progress of each child.

13. Does the Kindergarten Program include learning games?

Games suggested for use with each unit of instruction are designed to maximize the participation of children in activities which relate directly to attainment of unit skills.

14. Can any of the activities in the Kindergarten Program be performed by a non-professional?

When learning tasks require considerable practice (as they do in learning to read), non-professionals can help maintain and strengthen learning. The assistance of aides, parents, and other students can be a powerful tool in maximizing learning outcomes and individualizing instruction.

15. Must the suggested instructional schedule be followed?

It is recommended that the suggested instructional scheduling be followed in order to complete the program during the school year and to maximize skill attainment. Time allocations should be adjusted by the teacher to adapt to the abilities of the children in a given class.

16. Were the Instructional Support Systems developed for use with all pupils or just for those requiring additional help?

The Tutorial Program supplements regular classroom instruction in BRP by providing individualized practice for those pupils requiring additional help to attain program outcomes. The Parent Assisted Learning Program supplements regular classroom BRP instruction for the entire class by utilizing the structured assistance of each child's parents. The Summer Reading Program is a parent-managed program used following the kindergarten year. The program was developed to maintain the reading skills acquired in kindergarten.

17. What data exist on the effectiveness of the support programs (PAL, Tutorial and Summer Reading), in supplementing the reading instruction presented by the teacher?

Tryouts of each program revealed that its use in combination with BRP resulted in increased pupil achievement over use of BRP alone.

18. How structured is each of the Support Programs? Are there specific procedures for the tutor or parent to follow in responding to the pupil's answers?

The specially prepared materials used by tutors and parents provide pupils with individualized practice on program outcomes. Tutors and parents are trained in specific support skills such as how to respond to incorrect answers and how to conduct instructional practice sessions.

19. Are the Practice Exercises in the Tutorial Program different from the Practice Exercises in BRP?

No, the same Practice Exercises are used in both programs. These exercises, assigned on the basis of each child's Criterion Exercise performance, are designed to provide additional individual practice on specific unit skills.

20. Does the Summer Reading Program material include the same storybooks and practice exercises used in the BRP?

Parents using the Summer Reading Program receive ten weekly kits of specially prepared materials. Each kit contains practice exercises, a storybook, a record sheet, and an animal poster.

21. What is included in the Kindergarten Program Quality Assurance System?

The Quality Assurance System includes assessment materials and procedures developed to provide en route information on each aspect of the instructional and instructional support programs to insure that the prespecified performance criteria have been attained.

22. What kind of training is provided for the Kindergarten Program?

School district personnel are trained in program use prior to their participation in the Kindergarten Program. The Laboratory has developed systematic training programs for each of the instructional and support systems. Each training system includes: 1) a program for training district appointed trainers who in turn assume responsibility for training teachers, and 2) a program for training teachers.

The training system is organized to require approximately 1½ hours per program.

23. Can initial orders be placed for individual components of ICP and/or BRP, e.g., for storybooks only?

The integrity of instruction is protected by restricing initial orders to complete instructional systems: ICP and/or BRP.

24. Are the support systems available for purchase independent of the BRP?

Availability of the support systems is contingent upon purchase of the BRP. The support systems were developed and structured to supplement BRP, and assume initial BRP instruction by the classroom teacher.

25. How were publishers notified of the intended private sector distribution of the Kindergarten Program?

All eligible publishers received the February 15, 1971, Request for Proposal and all had an equal opportunity to respond to the BRP for publication and marketing of the program.